

★ AUG 20 2010 ★

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BROOKLYN OFFICE

ORDER

09-CV-2841 (SLT) (JMA)

----- x
MOHAMMED JAMIL, SYED AHMAD, SOFI MUGHAL,
and MOHAMMED RAHMAN, on behalf of themselves
and all other persons similarly situated, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

FINEST SECURITY SERVICE INC. and VINCENT
NEVILLE,

Defendants.

TOWNES, United States District Judge:

In this action, defendants Finest Security Service Inc. and Vincent Neville ("Defendants") have moved to dismiss the claims brought by plaintiffs Sofi Mughal and Mohammed Jamil ("Plaintiffs"). On March 25, 2010, United States Magistrate Judge Joan M. Azrack issued a Report & Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that Defendants' motion be granted with respect to the claims brought by Mughal, but denied with regard to the claims brought by Jamil. No objections have been filed in response to the R&R.

Before the Court considered the R&R, plaintiffs Syed Ahmad and Mohammed Rahman voluntarily dismissed their claims against the Defendants. (*See* Docket No. 22.) The stipulation of dismissal resulted in the Clerk of Court administratively closing the case. The case is now reopened and the Court adopts the R&R in its entirety. A district court is not required to review the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of a report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150

(1985). Nonetheless, when no objections are filed, many courts seek to satisfy themselves “that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee note (1983 Addition); *see also Edwards v. Town of Huntington*, No. 05-CV-339, 2007 WL 2027913, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. July 11, 2007). Although not required to do so, this Court has reviewed the record and is satisfied that there is no clear error.

Accordingly, this case is reopened, and the Court accepts Magistrate Judge Azrack’s Report and Recommendation dated March 25, 2010 in its entirety as the opinion of this Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Defendants’ motion to dismiss is granted as to the claims brought by plaintiff Sofi Mughal, but denied as to the claims brought by plaintiff Mohammed Jamil. The claims brought by plaintiff Sofi Mughal against the Defendants are hereby dismissed.

SO ORDERED.

/s/(SLT)

SANDRA L. TOWNES
United States District Judge

Dated: August 18, 2010
Brooklyn, New York